

REMARKS

Claim 1 has been amended. Claims 1-31 remain pending in this case.

In response to the restriction requirement, applicants respectfully assert that all of the current claims are unified insofar as they have a common special technical feature. That feature is the compound according to claim 1. As described on page 3, paragraphs 2 and 3 of the PCT application as published, the present invention encompasses the surprising discovery of efficient blue-shifted emission from compounds according to claim 1. In addition, the present invention provides a polymer which is both soluble and directly obtainable. The invention refers to the synthesis of these improved materials and their application (page 3, paragraph 2).

From the office action, the examiner has cited such compounds as being known from U.S. Patent No. 5,247,190. The examiner refers to two disclosures in the '190 patent to support his position. However, applicants respectfully disagree with the examiner. Col. 4, lines 5-67 disclose nothing more than PPV or other conjugated polymers derived from PPV where the phenylene ring has been replaced with an anthracene or naphthalene ring. This passage does not disclose materials according to claim 1, nor does it disclose that materials according to claim 1 are surprisingly blue-shifted in comparison with corresponding PPVs.

Col. 5, lines 1-41 of the '190 patent describes the possibility of increasing the number of vinylene moieties in the polymer and also describes the possibility of the ring system carrying one or more substituents. This disclosure is extremely general and there is no direct and unambiguous disclosure that placing substituents adjacent to one another would result in a blue shift of the emission of materials as recited in claim 1.

LAW OFFICES
FINNEGAN, HENDERSON,
FARABOW, GARRETT,
& DUNNER, L.L.P.
1300 I STREET, N. W.
WASHINGTON, DC 20005
202-408-4000

Furthermore, there is no information given in this document that would be obvious to the skilled person that this blue shift in emission could be obtained.

Accordingly, it is submitted that the special technical feature which unifies the present claims, i.e., a compound according to claim 1, is not known from U.S. Patent No. 5,247,190. Accordingly, it is submitted that the claims in their present form indeed are unified.

Despite traversing the examiner's restriction requirement, applicants elect with traverse Group 1, feature (i), and species RO-. The specification defines a preferred polymer as poly[(2,3-dibutoxy)-1,4-poly(phenylene vinylene)] on page 5, last sentence and page 8, middle paragraph.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, applicants respectfully request the reconsideration and reexamination of all claims in this application and the timely allowance of the pending claims.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our deposit account 06-0916.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

Dated: October 1, 2001

By: 
Therese A. Hendricks
Reg. No. 30,389

LAW OFFICES
FINNEGAN, HENDERSON,
FARABOW, GARRETT,
& DUNNER, L.L.P.
1300 I STREET, N. W.
WASHINGTON, DC 20005
202-408-4000